

REMARKS

In the July 14, 2004 Office Action, the specification was objected to and claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claims 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, and 16 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the July 14, 2004 Office Action, Applicant has amended the specification and claims 1, 7, and 9 as indicated above. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-16 are pending, with claims 1 and 9 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the specification was objected to as containing improper incorporation of essential material. In response, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion of the Office Action. As clearly stated in MPEP §201.13 G and §608.01 (p) I.B, Applicant may incorporate by reference foreign priority application by including a statement in the U.S. application-as-filed that the specifically enumerated foreign priority application is "hereby incorporated by reference." Accordingly, Applicant believes that this incorporation of Japanese Priority Application is proper.

Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

On page 2-3 of the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicant has amended claim 7 to clarify its language. Applicant believes that the claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,947,400 to Tsutsumi ("Tsutsumi patent"). In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9 to clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record. In particular, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite that the outer threaded portion of the screw member is mounted between the

tubular portion of the screw-in portion and the reel unit. Clearly, this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Tsutsumi patent or any other prior art of record.

More specifically, Applicant believes that the screw member of the Tsutsumi patent does not satisfy the requirement of claims 1 and 9 as now amended. The Office Action asserts that the nut 14 of the Tsutsumi patent corresponds to the screw member of claims 1 and 9. (Although the Office Action recites the member 9a as the screw member, Applicant interprets that it was meant to be the nut 14, since the member 9a of the Tsutsumi patent is a recessed portion of the adjusting handle. *See* column 4, lines 6-9 of the Tsutsumi patent.) The Office Action also asserts that the spool shaft 4 corresponds to the tubular portion. Although the Tsutsumi patent does not show the reel unit, it is presumed that a reel unit will be coupled to the right hand side end of the spool shaft 4 as seen in Figure 1. Thus, the nut 14 is clearly *not* mounted between the spool shaft 4 and the reel unit. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim within the reference. Accordingly, the Tsutsumi patent does *not* anticipate or suggest the arrangement of claims 1 and 9 as now amended.

Moreover, Applicant believes that the dependent claims 2-3, 6-8, 10-11, and 14 are also allowable over the prior art of record since they depend from the independent claims 1 and 9, and therefore are narrow. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not anticipate or suggested arrangement of the independent claims 1 and 9, neither does the prior art anticipate or suggest the arrangement of the dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, and 16 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Claims 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, and 16 as presented above remain dependent from claims 1 and 9. Since claims 1 and 9 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record, Applicant also believes that claims 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, and 16 remain allowable.

Prior Art Citation


In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicant believes that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

Appl. No. 10/692,726
Amendment dated November 4, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 14, 2004

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-16 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Kiyoe K. Kabashima
Reg. No. 54,874

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444

Dated: Nov 4, 2004
G:\11-NOV04-MTSN-US020494 Amendment.doc